


Aotearoa Youth Network



January 1995 Number 20

WHAT IS AOTEAROA YOUTH NETWORK?

The Aotearoa Youth Network is an organisation dedicated to building links between youth who are active in "progressive" politics. It is open to all and seeks to provide a place for discussion, learning and action across organisations, individuals and causes.

AYN was established at the 1993 Peace, Power and Politics Conference, where over 600 people (including over 150 young people) gathered. The main activity of AYN so far has been the production of a monthly newsletter, which presently goes to over 200 people, and reaches a far wider audience. AYN has established a positive presence in the progressive peoples' movement, and hopes to go beyond "networking" to assist in the formation of new organisations and groups.

We want to put anything in this magazine that you can write - news, articles, poetry, letters, anything. The more you write in, the more this magazine acts as a networking tool. We attempt to print anything you send without cutting but please note:

- We will not print anything that is overtly racist, sexist, homophobic or offensive to any marginalised group. If you want to debate issues that may offend people, try and be very clear about what you are trying to do, and why.

Deadline: 20th February.

Write to AYN at:
c/ - The Web Resource Centre
111 Moray Place
Dunedin.

Police Complaints Report "Illogical and Disappointing".

The Police Complaints Authority Report into Police behaviour at a student protest in Dunedin in 1993 has been labelled as illogical and disappointing by Mr Grant Robertson, who was the Otago University Students Association President and a protest leader during the incident.

"The report says that the police were wrong in going out the main doors of the Registry, but that they were not negligent in their duty. Yet it was this action that caused a confrontation to develop", Grant said.

"By the time that the police charged out with no warning there were a dwindling number of students who were sitting calmly with their backs to the door. There had been no real incidents for two hours. In my opinion if anyone incited the situation it was the police. Myself and a number of others had said that all that was required was some patience to wait for the crowd to disperse. The police ignored our advice.", Grant said.

Grant, who is now the Vice Pres of the N.Z. University Students Association, said that following the trial of students connected with the incident in May, many students had felt vindicated. The charges against two protesters were dismissed.

the police had used gratuitous and unnecessary force and that view mirrored those of most students who were there on the day. It is very disappointing that this report has not found the same conclusion..."

Grant said that he felt the Police Complaints Authority was not adequately resources to investigate an incident of this kind. The officers of the authority had spoken to very few of the complainants, he said.

"The Authority had to rely for most of its information on an investigation conducted by the Dunedin Police into the incident. This undermines the credibility and independence of the authority. The question must be raised if the public can really hold the police accountable".

Grant said that an issue such as large increases in student fees was one that many students and parents felt very strongly about.

"There will always be tension at these protests, and it is necessary to balance the right of people to protest with other rights, but I still felt that the police reacted very poorly on the day, and that they did indeed use unnecessary and gratuitous force."

• **Grant Robertson,
Wellington.**



"Judge David Carruthers said that

ACT - Why we should organise against them.

In November 1994 the ACT party led by Roger Douglas, Trevor De Cleene, Donna Awatere and a heap of other right wing rich people came into formal existence as a political party ready to contest the next election.

Up till then a lot of people on the left had dismissed ACT as a puny, puerile, Douglas clone organisation, which we shouldn't bother about. In fact, the most common attitude has been 'If we talk about ACT or organise demonstrations against them, we will only encourage the bastards and give them more publicity.'

However, as the ACT founding conference approached in November 1994 it was becoming clear that ACT was accumulating a lot of both financial support and a widespread membership, as it moved to become a party capable of contesting elections.

For example:

- ACT is being sponsored by corporate heavyweights like Craig Heatley, owner of Sky Television, with a wealth of around 25 million, and Alan Gibbs, merchant banker, who has a personal fortune of \$120 million.
- ACT's policies echo those of the Business Round Table, and BRT executive Director Roger Kerr enthusiastically supports ACT's vision for New Zealand.
- Thousands of people are rallying to ACT, many of them

not the very rich themselves, but people who aspire to become so: real estate agents, property developers, lawyers, accountants, company managers, self employed business people, 'consultants', and so on. We estimate that by now at least 2,000 people have formally joined ACT, and numbers may have reached 3,000.

- ACT is very well organised, with a large number of full time staff (thanks to its superb funding base), and increasing numbers of advocates professionally trained to carry Roger Douglas' messages out to community groups, work sites, universities and other educational institutions.

You might think that ACT is not a threat because it is unlikely ever to have a majority in Parliament. But ACT only needs between 5 and 15% of the vote in an MMP election to find itself as a strong partner in a National / ACT / other Right party coalition. Because of its funding base and organisational skills, it is likely to be the dominant party, not in numbers of MPs, but in skills and strength, and firmness of ideological conviction.

WE MUST TAKE ACTION NOW.

Many people, including many

young people, are being sucked into ACT by its confidence and fervour. ACT is about to launch a major policy push, using all media, including TV ads, to win people over. Maori people, too, are being conned into supporting ACT because of the high profile involvement of Donna Awatere-Huata, who is pushing for work for the dole as a solution to unemployment, among other things.

It is incredibly important that we work to expose ACT as publicly as possible, so that they can be clearly identified for what they are: a party dedicated to the policies of Roger Douglas and the Business Round Table, and convinced of the need to privatise EVERYTHING, from all hospitals through to all schools and universities.

In Auckland, a coalition called 'Counter ACT' has been set up by people from trade union, student, unemployed, beneficiary, community and political organisations with the sole purpose of taking every action possible to expose and oppose ACT.

Our first action was to hold a demonstration outside ACT's founding conference on November 5, and we have received a lot of support both then, and since.

We ask you to consider organising in your own area against ACT, using any means at your disposal.

A big part of our organising work needs to be educating other people about ACT's policies and

strategies. I haven't been able to do this here because of lack of space, but Counter ACT has produced an in depth document which contains a lot of information, and we are keen to get it disseminated as widely as possible.

If you would like a copy of our document; if you would like to send us a donation; or if you would like to get in touch with us about organising activity in your area, get hold of us at:

Auckland Counter ACT, PO Box 3813, Auckland 1.
Fax 09 377 4804, or phone Sue on 09 302 2496 or Grant on 09 827 8490.

For anyone living in the Auckland region who would like to get involved with Counter ACT, our next meeting will be held:
Wednesday 22 February 1995, 10 - 11.30, 1st floor, the Peoples Centre, 33 Wyndham St, City.

**Sue Bradford, Auckland
Unemployed Workers Rights
Centre / Counter ACT.**

The Mutual Assistance Programme

Contact between the New Zealand military forces and their Indonesian counterparts is growing as the New Zealand government seeks closer defence relationships with ASEAN nations. Both countries have defence attaches in their embassies and the New Zealand Air Force and Navy have exercised with their Indonesian counterparts. The key element in this relationship is the Mutual Assistance Programme (MAP). MAP links with Indonesia began in 1973.

MAP is New Zealand's overseas military aid programme and is set up to provide training to foreign armed personnel in New Zealand and to send instructors to provide training overseas. Aid is primarily sent to South Pacific nations, with a smaller programme in South East Asia.

In 1993 / 1994, Indonesia received the second largest share of military received by the South East Asian nations involved in the programme (after Malaysia). MAP aims 'to develop a practical working relationship with the Indonesian Armed Forces' and to 'contribute to the effectiveness of these forces'. The human rights record of the recipient armed forces has no bearing on the allocation of military aid.

Since Indonesia began its military occupation of East Timor, the New Zealand Army has trained Indonesian infantry officers, small arms and combat instructors. Officers train in New Zealand, return to Indonesia and in turn train 'a large number of instructors in the techniques they were taught in New Zealand.'

Indonesian marine patrol pilots are trained in New Zealand using the Air New Zealand Boeing 737 simulator in Auckland. These pilots fly Indonesia's radar surveillance planes, modified 737s purchased by Indonesia from the United States in 1983.

The New Zealand defence Force also runs an ongoing programme of lectures and training in military dentistry for the Indonesian Armed Forces. Every alternate year since 1973, a New Zealand Army officer studies at the Indonesian Army Staff College at Bandung, before being appointed as Defence Attache in Jakarta.

In 1978, as New Zealand supported the Indonesian military, the government sent a RNZAF Hercules to East Timor, carrying milk powder and biscuits for East Timorese made refugees by Indonesian military campaigns.

Skyhawks.

When questioned by relatives of Kamal Bamadhaj, a New Zealander murdered by troops in East Timor in 1991, Foreign Affairs Minister Don McKinnon claimed that military co-operation with Indonesia was restricted to dental and health care, 'it has nothing to do with weapons'. That year, courses in small arms shooting and Skyhawk maintenance were offered to Indonesia.

In 1991, just after his visit to New Zealand, General Try Sutrisno called unarmed East Timorese protesters shot by Indonesian forces in Dili 'ill-bred people' who 'have to be shot'. The New Zealand Government had just announced that sixty places were available for Indonesian soldiers under MAP. After an investigation into the massacre began, Try Sutrisno declared 'Once the investigation is accomplished, we will wipe out the separatist elements who have tainted the government's dignity.' Try Sutrisno is now Vice President of Indonesia.

Skyhawks.

One of the most offensive MAP courses trains Indonesian Skyhawk technicians. The Indonesian have 28 A4 Skyhawk ground attack aircraft sold to Indonesia in the late 1970s by the United States. Indonesian Air Force Skyhawks were used in bombing missions in East Timor during the 1983 / 84 offensive, specialising in incendiary, cluster and anti-personnel bombing. New Zealand's Skyhawks have exercised with the Indonesian Air Force since 1979. The RNZAF trains Skyhawk airframe, engine and avionics technicians, and trains officers at the RNZAF Senior Command and Staff College. Forward Air Controllers, who direct bombing missions, were trained in New Zealand in 1987. Skyhawk flying instructors have also been trained in New Zealand.

US bans military aid.

In 1992 the United States Congress cut off funding for Indonesian military training under the IMET (International Military Education and Training) programme, the US equivalent of MAP, because of Indonesian human rights abuses in East Timor. Congress protested when the Department of Defence continued to provide training under payment by the Indonesians, and in 1994 the House of Representatives voted to ban all military training for Indonesia.

The Indonesian Armed Forces.

Unlike the New

of their country. Their power was strengthened following an army backed coup in 1965 which pushed General Suharto into power.

The role of the Indonesian Armed Forces in officially formulated under the term dual function, the function of a social political force and the function of soldiering. The armed forces have developed social, economic and political structures which enhance the military's role of internal repression and social control.

Indonesian military leaders have regularly stated that they do not envisage being faced with an external threat in the foreseeable future. Armed forces Commander-in-Chief Feisal Tanjung added that the military's social political role will become increasingly important because the biggest threat to national security is expected to be internal, from Indonesian society and politics.

The armed forces have a major role in administration and politics.

According to the New Zealand Defence Force, 'most senior Indonesian officials have a military background or military connections'. President Suharto is a General, as is Vice President Try Sutrisno. 100 seats in the Indonesian parliament area automatically allocated to the armed forces.

Human Rights Abuses.

According to Asia Watch, a US human rights organisation, the Indonesian military continue to break up strikes even after international pressure forced a decree revoking their power to do so. The US State Department's annual human rights report for 1993 accused the Indonesian Armed Forces of serious abuses, saying 'extrajudicial arrests and detention with suspected criminals or perceived troublemakers continued in many parts of Indonesia.' Amnesty International found that 'disregard for human life is an integral part of the Indonesian security forces

**Free East Timor
Stop Military Aid to Indonesia.**

Zealand military,

t h e

Indonesian Forces (ABRI)

central role in the political life

Armed

play a

Provincial and local government staffs have a high proportion of armed forces personnel.

'Territorial' army units are placed in all provincial capitals and small towns, where their prime function is to ensure that political challenges to the regime are suppressed.

approach to its work.'

In 1994,

General Hartono,

Chief of the social and political affairs department

of the military said that 'the role

of ABRI's social and political

activities should be heightened.' As

the central concern of the Indonesian

Armed Forces in internal security, it

is difficult to see what purpose is

served by training Indonesian Armed

Forces, other than making them


more effective in the repression of

dissent within Indonesia and the

crushing of resistance in its

occupied territories.

Jo Buchanan.



Facts About Intellectual Property Rights

Why should anyone involved with retail food cooperatives be concerned about GATT?

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is a multi-lateral agreement governing the conduct of international trade. Last December, the "Uruguay Round" of the GATT negotiations concluded with a call for the creation of a World Trade Organization (WTO) to govern global trade. Retail food cooperatives vary somewhat in their missions, but the trade regime which the WTO will oversee will have potentially great effects on activities of significance to all coops — ranging from effects on the viability of their efforts to guarantee the quality of foods they carry, to the effectiveness of their promotion of local and sustainable agriculture, to the potential of their attempts to encourage more democratic participation in basic affairs of society.

GATT and democracy

For some coops, one of the central purposes is to provide an opportunity for people to play a more active role in the basic decisions effecting their lives, in this case, decisions about the character of their working environment. Insofar as coops wish to extend their concern about participatory democracy to the world at large, they have good reason to consider GATT a serious threat. GATT represents a danger to any notion that citizens in general have a right to control the world around them.

The WTO arbitration panels signify what this danger is about. The panels are composed of three trade representatives who are not elected and who are obliged to rule in favor of measures facilitating trade, with other issues being subordinate. There is no provision under arbitration provisions for introduction of alternative perspectives, such as amicus briefs from non-governmental organizations, which might raise concerns about environmental or labor conditions.

Furthermore, GATT forces governments to amend laws and even rewrite their constitutions to ensure that they are in line with GATT principles. Paragraph 4 of Article XVI states: "Each member shall ensure the conformity of its laws, regulations and administrative procedures with its obligations as provided in the annexed Agreements." The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) provides a good example of the pressures this will create on governments and citizens. In anticipation of NAFTA, Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari and his ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) changed a provision in the Mexican constitution which protects

collective farms (ejidos). The ejidos, though often functioning imperfectly, have been an important form of protection for small Mexican farmers confronted by the increasing industrialization of Mexican agriculture. With the repeal of the ejido law, it is now possible for Mexican or foreign investors to buy up the ejidos, thus potentially displacing millions of farmers.

It was in part in reaction to this that the Zapatista rebels in Chiapas, Mexico took over the town of San Cristobal de Las Casas last January. The Zapatistas called for renegotiation of NAFTA and focused the world's attention on the huge economic burdens faced by the victims of Mexico's neoliberal economic policies. A world ruled by GATT principles seems destined to produce more moves like those of the PRI and more reactions like those of the Zapatistas.

GATT principles may not protect collective forms of property like ejidos, but they do protect international investors with stringent requirements for the maintenance of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs). The insistence on IPRs forces governments to recognize patent claims on products developed by companies and individual inventors, even if the product is developed from materials created by local producers over generations. Thus, for example, a University of Wisconsin scientist took out a patent on the neem tree, used for generations in India, simply on the basis of having participated in the development of a mass production process for neem. Indians who process neem themselves and use it for myriad purposes can thus be required to pay royalties for use of neem products. No one in India receives royalties for the generations of work which have gone into finding the various uses of neem. Appropriately, some commentators have referred to this usurpation of traditional people's rights to use their own crops as "the second enclosure of the commons." Codifying this enclosure movement, and thus strengthening the position of transnational corporations at the expense of local groups, is one of the major purposes of GATT and the WTO.

Finally, it is worth noting that both the NAFTA and GATT negotiation and approval processes are in and of themselves tremendous affronts to the notion that average citizens are entitled to a say in affairs effecting their lives. NAFTA was negotiated by the Bush administration under advice from business leaders with virtually no input from labor or environmental groups. The Bush administration made sure that there would be little labor input by violating federal requirements and failing to

GATT and Retail Food Cooperatives

Jim Glassman
Minnesota Food Association

present a draft of NAFTA to the US Labor Advisory Committee on NAFTA in timely fashion. NAFTA was approved under "fast-track" procedures which prevented the US Congress from attempting to change any of its provisions as a condition for its implementation. Thus, the public was prevented from participating in the creation of the trade accord. Even so, it required shameless vote-buying by the Clinton administration to push the agreement through Congress.

Now the Clinton administration appears prepared to push GATT forward in the same fashion. The Uruguay Round was completed with little participation by anyone besides US business leaders and trade representatives. GATT is likely to be voted up or down on the fast track, and it is possible that the push for ratification will be accompanied by the same kinds of political machinations that accompanied approval of NAFTA.

Food coops which consider themselves to be part of a citizens' movement for greater empowerment have good reason to be concerned that GATT represents the antithesis of their own efforts.

GATT and food safety

Under GATT, acceptable standards of food safety will be determined by the Codex Alimentarius, a United Nations organization which is heavily influenced by industry. Many of the food safety standards established by this body are weaker than existing US standards. Once the WTO is in place, countries which maintain standards more stringent than those of Codex will be subject to challenges from other governments for establishing barriers to trade. Under these circumstances, a WTO arbitration panel would decide how to rule in the dispute. If the panel decided against the country with tougher food safety standards than the Codex, that country would be forced to either change its standards or else face sanctions and retaliation.

In addition, the WTO could make it more difficult for food coops to maintain the confidence of their customers in the safety and quality of their products. It has been suggested, for example, that an existing Minnesota law regulating the field release of genetically engineered organisms could be ruled a trade barrier under GATT principles. Extending this claim, it seems reasonable to suspect that laws attempting to regulate the use of genetic engineering in food production might be found to inhibit trade. Given the concern of many consumers about potential allergic reactions to foods with unidentified additives, this should be a matter of interest to coops.

In principle, coops could deal with this concern by promoting labeling of foods that are genetically engineered or produced using genetic engineering. But recent challenges to the labeling of milk as not containing Bovine Growth Hormone (BGH) show that this approach could be treacherous. Furthermore, the possibility that GATT rules could be used to interpret labeling laws themselves as barriers to trade should not be ruled out at this point. Similar issues could be raised with regard to the viability, under GATT of attempts to promote organic agriculture and to certify foods as organically grown.

GATT, Local Agriculture and Sustainability

Many coops see their missions as not only involving the promotion of good food but also of locally-grown produce. GATT threatens this project by making it difficult for countries to maintain subsidies or forms of protection for local growers. Indeed, GATT requires that the United States import a minimum of 5 percent of domestic consumption for every crop consumed.

The potential impact of measures such as this has already been discussed extensively in the case of the NAFTA. NAFTA will force the Mexican government to abandon subsidies to small farmers producing corn. The likely impact of this on these farmers is that they will be driven out of business by cheaper imports of corn from the United States and Canada. In Minnesota, likely victims of NAFTA and GATT would include sugar beet producers, who currently benefit from subsidies and other measures that inhibit cheaper sugarcane imports. In addition, programs supporting local agriculture, such as "Minnesota Grown," could be challenged as trade barriers under NAFTA and GATT.

Sustainable agricultural practices will be threatened under GATT as well. Any attempts by states or countries to control imports on the basis of the process or method of production is referred to under GATT as a "technical barrier to trade" (TBT). Any attempts to insure that imported products are produced sustainably could be ruled a TBT by the WTO. In addition, attempts to promote local sustainable agriculture through subsidies or other measures would be a violation of GATT principles. Yet such subsidies to sustainable and organic producers may be necessary to offset the artificially cheap price of many conventional products, which only cost as little as they do because the price of problems like soil erosion, ill health from pesticides, and fossil fuel pollution are not internalized but passed on to society in general. GATT would make it difficult to maintain programs that would level the playing field for sustainable and organic practices.

For all of these reasons, then, retail food cooperatives should be concerned about the potential passage of GATT. Passage is not a *fait accompli*, however, nor is GATT irreversible if it does gain US Congressional approval. By working with groups which are organizing in opposition to GATT, coops can play a role in preventing GATT from undermining the viability of attempts to insure availability of safe food, produced sustainably and on ways compatible with the development of a politically and economically democratic society.

For more information, contact:

Minnesota Safe Food Link, 1313 Fifth Street SE, Suite 303, Minneapolis, MN. USA 55414. Telephone: (612)379-5980; fax: (612) 379-5982.

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, 1313 Fifth Street SE, Suite 303, Minneapolis, MN. USA 55414. Telephone: (612)379-5980; fax: (612) 379-5982.

One in a series of fact sheets on Intellectual Property Rights available from the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
1313 5th St. SE, Suite 303, Minneapolis, MN 55414 (612) 379-5980, fax (612) 379-5982 email iatp@igc.apc.org

THE FISCAL ENVELOPE

The Release of the Crown's settlement Proposals:

The booklets released by the Crown on December 8th continue the trend towards the imposition of Crown agendas without the benefit of Maori input.

The only highlight of a bleak couple of days for our country was Ta Hepi's refusal of Prime Minister Bolger's dinner and date and the publication of his reasons.

Much less inspiring was the choice of 0800-80-1840 as the number of the Toll Free phone for requesting copies of the booklets. Also, the Third booklet, 'Consultation with Maori', which was very poorly advertised, was not readily available from the Toll Free number, and although the operators didn't know this and invariably failed to live up to assurances that they would post it.

Perhaps the Crown was ashamed of the completely unrealistic and un-Maori agendas of the Regional and National Hui contained in Booklet 3, or perhaps the entire distribution of the two main booklets is aimed at Pakeha, so that they can congratulate the Crown on keeping the conservation estate out of the pool of assets available for use as compensation, and on other aspects that appeal to them.

Another downer over the same period was the fact that although 250 people turned out at the Indonesian Embassy for an East Timor demonstration earlier in the week, no more than 35 could muster at Parliament to burn the booklets in front of Doug. As in 1981, someone else's acts of colonisation are a far more

acceptable target than your own.

Major Aspects of the case for rejecting the proposals:

The proposals were developed without any serious attempt to canvass Maori about how they feel about the methods of resolving the legacy of the disastrous, unjust and embarrassing actions of the Crown and successive Governments since 1840. This insulting and stupid omission is based on the belief that 'Kawanatanga', the governing of us, can ride rough shod over 'Rangatiratanga', or the Mana of Iwi. I, for one, don't believe that it should. This false belief has led to the insistence of cabinet on the ridiculously low cap of \$1 billion.

Considering:

- the current value of assets wrongfully alienated.
- the fact that much of the current wealth of Aotearoa has been extracted from those assets.
- the deep pain inflicted on successive generations of Maori as a result of being labelled rebels, separated from sacred sites and rendered landless.
- the current socio-economic state of the majority of Maori as a direct result of this alienation of assets.

ask yourself. 'How full and final is this settlement likely to be?'

\$1 billion, (less overhead!) is an insulting offer to compensate for such major injustice. The clamour for a restarting of negotiations should be deafening, from both Pakeha and Maori.

Making a submission.

Doug Graham has said that if the people of Aotearoa overwhelmingly reject his proposals, they will obviously have to be rethought. One way of ensuring that Doug knows how you fell is to send him a formal submission, as the booklets invite you to do. Included with this article is a copy of a submission card which expresses rejection of the proposals. This is offered as a very easy way to express opposition now, even if you plan to make more detailed and reasoned personal or group submissions later.

If you are willing to sign and post a card, please consider photocopying it and passing it onto other people who may share your view. By mailing your signed submission back to us in a stamped envelope you would help us to log the names before sending them on free, thereby keeping Doug honest. Otherwise, just drop it unstamped into any mailbox.

Discussion of the proposals, and the recruiting of signatures for posted submissions, offers an opportunity to continue the education of the Pakeha masses about the historical basis for Maori grievances. A directory of regional groups and individuals who may help with this can be found after this.

• **John Tovey, Nga Kaiwhakanekeneke, 30 Gavin Rd, Raumati.**

Pakeha groups who may help provide background information to Maori grievances.

Network Waitangi Otautahi: 187 Cashel St, CHCH
Ph (03) 365 5266, Fax (03) 366 8535
or c/- ph (03) 384 1281

Network Waitangi Tai Poutini:

PO Box 80 Hokitika

Peter Allen Ph (03) 755 7591 Fax (03) 768 7133

Network Waitangi Taranaki:

Marlene Benson Marine Motor Camp

PO Box 36 Waitara.

Network Waitangi Wellington: 171 Daniell St.

Jeff Drane Ph (04) 389 8121 wk 389 9730 hm

Sylvia Bagnall Ph (04) 389 210 wk 384 3077
hm

Network Waitangi Whangarei PO Box 5098

Moea Armstrong Ph (09) 436 1679

Project Waitangi Tamaki-makau-rau:

PO Box 5510 Wellesly St

Karena Ph (09) 483 6493 Fax (09) 307 4933
also Jane and Joan.

Project Waitangi Manawatu:

PO Box 9086 Te Papa-i-oea

Peter McDermott (P. North).

A.F.I.A. PO Box 1905 Otautahi:

Jo Davies Ph (03) 366 2803 Fax (03) 365 2919.

CCANZ Prog. On Racism:

PO Box 9573 Tamaki-makau-rau

Mitzi Nairn Ph (09) 525 4179 Fax (09) 525
4346.

DI Das 63 Poplar Ave Raumati South

Tai Kapiti Ph (04) 297 1476.

Kawanatanga Network PO Box 218 Kirikirioa

John Kirton Ph (07) 854 8997

Trish and Ken Ph (07) 849 4481

Gwenda Montieth Paul Ph (07) 312 4364.

Rowan Partnership: 260 Wicksteed St
Whanganui

David James and Jillian

Wychell

Ph (06) 345 6732 Fax (06)

347 1740.

Waikato Anti Racism

Coalition

(John Kirton, Kawanatanga

Network)

Waitangi Workshops PO Box

35089 Otautahi

Bob Consedine Ph (03) 383

3182.

YWCA Consultancy PO Box

9315 Te Whanga-nui-a-Tara:

Marion Wood Ph (04) 384

1150 Fax (04) 3843301.

New Zealand Corporate Profits 1994

New Zealand's twenty largest public companies accumulated \$3.4 billion profits this year, according to *Management Magazine's* annual survey.

This accounted for 76% of the profits of the 200 largest companies in the survey. Profits for the top 200 companies were up 72% over 1993.

The twenty largest corporations paid \$914 million income tax, 21% of their pre-tax incomes and less than the tax rate paid by beneficiaries.

New Zealand's 200 largest corporations employ more than 183,000 workers.

NZ's 20 Most Profitable Corporations 1994

	Profit (After Tax) \$ million	Tax Provision \$ million
Fletcher Challenge	675	13
Telecom*	528	237
Brierley Investments	430	-3
Electricorp	397	175
Carter Holt Harvey*	325	-
Bank of New Zealand*	236	95
Lion Nathan	221	-9
Air New Zealand	191	8
Forestry Corp	157	23
National Bank*	151	64
Shell NZ*	143	52
Westpac*	115	39
ANZ*	79	36
Trust Bank*	73	39
NZ Post	67	34
NZ Refining*	57	29
Mobil Oil*	54	17
Caltex*	51	16
Rothmans*	49	26
Independent Newspapers*	47	23
Total	3417	914

* Foreign Owned

Todd Report

Within two hours of option A of the Todd Report being implemented by Lockwood Smith a small group of determined students from Auckland and Otago Universities and the Auckland Institute of Technology occupied the Ministry of Education in Auckland. As a workplace fulfilling the policies of the National Government this was a good starting point to vent our anger and frustration as students whose views are continually being ignored by those in power.

We were there to say NO to the Todd Report. We were there to say no, students are suffering extreme financial hardship without paying thousands of dollars extra for a degree with no contribution to their living costs. All around the country parents are watching their children shoulder loans of up to \$30,000. Living beyond our means has become normal and many of us realise that we will have this debt for the rest of our lives. Why are

we being forced to think of education only in terms of our own benefit and losses, when surveys have proved that most of the people in this country believe that educating our children is a communities responsibility? Knowledge is to be shared, not priced and packaged. But students and their families are responding throughout this country - the mainstream media won't tell you this.

We occupied the roof of the National Party Headquarters two days later with a bigger group of people. Waikato students hit the main street in Hamilton with petitions. Students occupied the Ministry of Education in Dunedin and are planning more actions. These are only the most obvious forms of action. How many young people out there went home and discussed the reality of funding with their parents and decided, no, the price of this knowledge is too

high? How many dentistry students gave up their degrees this summer? How many decided to charge \$400 a visit for their dental patients in order to pay off their loans? How many decided to stay on the dole so that they didn't have to worry about how to pay their loans back? How many parents wished they had opened a bank account for their children's education the day that they were born?

I wonder if the government of this country feels any responsibility for the pain of these people or understands the breakdown of our communities under the user pays system. The next time we occupy a building I think that we should invite our parents, neighbours, teachers, ministers, doctors and our whole community.

• Cybele Locke.



Letters to the Network

I'm afraid to say I found Fergus' articles a confusing mess. His contradictions, condescension (to the point of arrogance), and the shallowness of this analysis alarms me. While I appreciate Fergus' work as a long term activist, his experience accords him the responsibility to look deeper, understand better and offer more to his fellow activists.

Fergus seems to have become frustrated with some of his colleagues, but by resorting to blaming individuals Fergus isolates activists from the society they live in and are attempting to change.

In western countries in the twentieth century there has been a change in consciousness with peoples primary identification moving from production (work) to consumption. In response to peoples' sudden potential to escape from material need, an escape which threatened capitalism's survival, an ideology of need was created in capitalist societies. The effect is that despite the lack of material necessity, I still feel a need to use cars, drink beer, travel or whatever. Cultures continue to create new desires and new needs, and it's getting harder and harder for even extreme marxist reductionists to reduce these to material necessity.

However Fergus castigates individuals or taking part in society. He describes them as "hypocrites", "blind as a mob of bats", "Gullible", "as bad as Doug Myers." However much you dislike aspects of our society, this sort of diatribe against people acting normally in the societies they happen to have socialised into achieves nothing but the alienation of the activist from the rest of society. I don't think there is any future in it - most people want to lessen their

alienation, not increase it in return for achieving some moral high ground. To explain consumption as people simply "falling for all those adverts" is to explain disdain for the normally socialised majority, and to fail to understand that the absence of *material* need doesn't mean a greedy indulgence. People are trying to fulfil their needs from the options open to them, which are pretty limited and don't offer much real satisfaction. This is the ideal state of affairs for capitalism to keep people on increasing consumption, but should activists be chastising people for doing the best they can in the societies they live in?

Fergus talks like he thinks people are plain thick. He follows up his individualistic, reactionary attack with a solution sodden with nostalgia, imagining some former "perfect social welfare system" and the old days when the "everyday tasks of survival were satisfaction enough". Dreaming of a utopian past with people sitting around enjoying the simple things in life "as happy as Larry". Reactionary nonsense more akin to Thatcherism than progressive politics. This is the he sort of conservative line the McGillicuddies are satirising with their "Great Leap Backwards" policies. It used to be the domain of the old right, but Fergus tries to claim it as "progressive."

This sort of thinking has been a disaster for the left, and the point isn't just that berating people doesn't help. It is an attitude that fails to understand the nature of society and offers nostalgia (and a white middle class nostalgia at that), It's just

a brand of left wing conservatism which has no claim at all to the title of progressive. We need to reclaim progressive thinking, otherwise the left will be left behind, a quaint, irrelevant quirk of history.

After railing against people for getting jobs for the money ("economic overrides common sense") and for being "too damned individualistic (=stupid) to see otherwise, Fergus finally acknowledges that "half the reason people work is for the social reasons." So we are still left with the crucial question, why don't people take on activist work? Or (a better question) why do they? Fergus paints a picture of the satisfaction of activist work ("unimaginable to people in paid work"), but, if so, why does Fergus think people who "seem so committed" leave? Simply that they 'listen to what the rednecks think and get jobs instead of making up their own minds'? If Fergus really wants to understand the cause of activist's disillusionment he should first examine his own attitudes. Patronising others isn't going to make them feel appreciated. Fergus never mentions asking the people who leave activisms for a paid job why they decide to leave, instead he stands around, open mouthed and stunned into silence, while the ex-activists, now beyond the pale, disappear into the paid work force.

Instead of analysis, Fergus relies on little homilies: "once the satisfaction of a job well done was reward in itself, people were happy enough with sufficient to be comfortable, it worked in the past and is working unofficially now." So why does Fergus think its failing for activists? His only

answer is to blame individuals for their greed and gullibility, when actually it's working just as well as activists as anyone else, ie. not very well: some of us manage, some manage for a while, others not at all. There are grassroots activists trying to live off social welfare and working for Kohanga Reo, Women's Refuge, food banks, etc. and it's a stressful, demanding lifestyle.

As a fulltime activist on the dole, I get pissed off with Fergus' attitude. Personally I get tired of scraping by from week to week, not being able to afford a drink, a holiday or dinner out with friends, etc. I don't need people like Fergus acting aghast at the thought of me getting a paid job. I would expect Fergus to realise that activism isn't always so satisfying - it's often depressing, frustrating and soul destroying - and having to do it without a little pecuniary consolation sure doesn't help.

I don't think that it is just the allure of money which drives people away from activism, part of the trouble is that activist groups offer neither the consolation of cash, nor the undemanding social environment of the paid work force where the Boss / worker schism creates a stable little structure of antagonistic, internally supportive blocs. At least in the work force you can leave your job behind at the

end of the day. You know you're just there for the money and aren't subject to continual self-questioning and analysis.

I think Fergus' radical perspective is weakened by his isolation from the cash economy ("I try to stay out of it as much as possible") - this may be a fine alternative lifestyle - but how is it supposed to appeal to the working majority, especially those whom Fergus acknowledges as needing a full wage - when buying a house, bringing up kids, etc? (And which for many people is the majority of their working lives). We need social activists rooted in society, real grassroots activists, not the alternative stylers Fergus calls grassroots (and advises to pull up their roots in order to avoid the halls of Mammon). If we really developed a community of activists in the existing social environment the need for full time activists would disappear. Accepting activism as an alternative lifestyle means accepting marginalisation, a far cry from the days when the left tried to change society as a whole, build mass movements and mobilise.

Instead of challenging the

ideological curtains that exist to keep the workings of society hidden, Fergus embarks on another layer of obscurism. He calls for voluntary work to be taken just as seriously as paid work but with idealism, not money holding it together. He tries to hide the reality of activist work, which often isn't much fun, and can be as alienating as the wage work system. And what does Fergus offer instead of money to make his system work? More ideology, even though it is ideology - the ideology of need - that keeps the system going at the moment. The whole spectrum of progressive activism should be trying to pull ideologies apart, trying to understand the nature of the beast by scrutinising the structures and ideologies the system uses and which penetrate our groups and ourselves.

It's not the lack of structure that is hard to get the hang of in activist groups. My experience is that the structures are there but you can't get the hang of them because they are not apparent and never articulated - they're informal but never-the-less very effective.

Decisions are often made by small in groups with the knowledge and personal familiarity, and pushed onto the wider group, who aren't given the trust, information and support to challenge them. As groups form and grow they develop ideologies, dogmas and structures which are assumed but never spelt out (and hence are unable to be challenged). This can be hell of a hard to get the hang of and if new people do eventually work it out they probably won't feel particularly endeared to the group (and if they



don't they'll feel sidelined without understanding why and end up wondering if the problem lies with themselves).

People leave because they are not being given the respect of the group, rather they are expected to earn it (a basic device for maintaining hierarchy, the sort of tactic used by schools and patriarchs). Rather than enacting their professed egalitarianism groups want people as poster paste uppers, stall sitters and envelope stuffers but keep the decision making to the experienced old guard who have done their time at the bottom years ago.

Activist group's proclaimed lack of structure and egalitarianism shields their dogmas, cliches and ideologies, their in groups, structures and processes from challenges. The iconoclasm of the new and young (the best thing new, inexperienced activists can offer to a group) at best goes unvalued and at worst is feared and resisted. Challenge the group demagogues and you get written off as trouble, in the same way that Fergus attacks people with his 'blame the individual' attitude to the depletion of the activist community.

In another individualistic attack Fergus asserts that people are madly scrambling over each other to avoid "contemplating the materialist drive", and that no-one actually wants spare time. This is extraordinary! All the workers I know would love more spare time (I don't know who Fergus hangs out with), but they've been forced into working longer and harder by capitalism, forced to compete with each other just to keep a job and retain the little control over their lives that having an income allows, at least when the only other option is the dole. But Fergus accuses people of standing by "leaving it to the market forces to sort it out" (although he contradicts himself in his next sentence when he says "We've [who? Not me mate!] dumped all our spare time on the usual groups who make up the unemployed"). Here Fergus adopts

the voice of the liberal media commentator, a device invented in the United States to sell the myth that the driving force of history in capitalist democracy is consumer choice and individual decision ("social trends are the responsibility of all of us.."). Apparently Fergus doesn't believe that there may be contradictions within society or even opposing interests, instead he blames the workers for (he imagines) imposing capitals dreams on themselves. It's this sort of woolly liberal thinking that makes marxists look sane.

Fergus claims the strength of the activist movement depends on having full time activists always ready to respond, and blames the movements failures on the lack of such activists. I think the strength of the activist campaigns lies in their diversity of contributions. The narrowing of campaigns correlates directly with their failure. The nuclear ships ban succeeded because it was so broad and diverse that it was extremely hard to attack, and very easy for people with all sort of views to come onside. When the campaign narrowed to concentrate on one issue (port safety) to the exclusion of others (militarism, US imperialism, third world solidarity, etc), it became much easier to attack. The No Frigates campaign (which both Fergus and Melanie Hutton claim as a success, despite its obvious failure) started off with a diversity of agendas and opinions, but narrowed to almost a single dogma: military spending is diverting money from social spending, summed up in the simplistic slogan "jobs not frigates", and the campaign failed on both counts. The old right settled for two frigates and the promise of manufacturing



contracts and the new right kept up social spending cuts anyway; but by proclaiming the frigates campaign a success activists avoided analysing its failure. Diversity is hard to attack, and it's also hard to control, both from those outside the campaign and by those inside.

I am not trying to legitimise apathy or cynicism, but if we are trying to overcome an obstacle we ought to understand how it is put together, it won't just crumble under the weight of our invective, but an intelligent discussion may do the trick.

Fergus' attitude stems from what seems to be a dearth of debate on theory and analysis in much of the activist movement (I'd exclude some feminist groups and indigenous groups which seem to maintain an intellectual climate). Activists should recognise that theory is a tool to be used in the same way that computers and megaphones are activist tools. Activists need to work from understanding. Antagonism isn't much of a basis on which to build social change.

• **Jo Buchanan, Wellington.**

PS I'm writing in reply to the printed version of Fergus' article, Fergus may want to disclaim some of his comments in the unintentionally printed draft version of part one of his article.

International News

Coming Up

Burma

Recently the second meeting took place between Aung San Suu Kyi and members of the Burmese ruling junta SLORC. The latest meeting attended by General Khin Nyunt and others was characterised by a change in attitude that indicated real dialogue between the military regime and the interned leader of the democratically elected government is possible and is indeed becoming a reality. The importance of these meetings to the military regime is considerable. Commentators suggest that continued international pressure is forcing the SLORC to make serious efforts to reach an accommodation with Aung San Suu Kyi and it is clear that the local importance of any accord that can be reached is not underestimated by SLORC. The course of the second meeting was fully televised throughout Burma and the broadcasts were watched with great interest. The issue of democracy in Burma is not dead among the people who are most affected by its denial.

Papua New Guinea

At a Trade Union Conference on Human, Trade Union and Democratic Rights in the South Pacific the PNG Prime Minister Sir Julius Chan gave a provocative speech outlining his views on democracy and development. Equating growth with development, Sir Julius proposed, without reference to the extremely high cost of living in Papua New

Guinea which puts it on a par with Australia and New Zealand, that growth would be assured if more people were employed in the formal economy and if they were paid only 20% of the present wage average. He suggested that the growth of Trade Unions had prevented the growth of the formal economy and that it would have been better if the establishment of Trade Union had been deferred until more people were involved in formal employment.

Sir Julius went on to propose that in accepting the crucial need to seek the protection of human rights, and the need at all times to protect the rights of the worker and maintain a commitment to democratic rights, it was however necessary always to take into account levels of development. He stressed the uniqueness of Papua New Guinea's social and cultural structure and said that it was improper to import ideas about models of industrial relations which would create problems where none existed.

Pursuing the thesis that considerations of human rights and democracy can only follow development and not lead it he closed by saying "... if we are willing to make the sacrifices needed, if we nurture the plant of human development, we will find that human, workers and democratic rights emerge naturally as the fruit of our labours."

- PPTI Asia Pacific News, December 1994.

3rd Anarcha-Feminist Conference,

February 17-19th.

Held in bucolic surroundings at the picturesque Makahika Lodge, Gladstone Road, Levin.

Cost: \$25-35.

Workshops on Sexuality, Anarcha-Feminist theory, Fiscal Envelope, Homophobia, Public speaking, Cycle maintenance and much more.

Contact: Katipo Collective, PO Box 14-156, Kilbirnie, Wellington, or phone Lyn, (04) 384 2827.

3rd Sustainable Energy Conference

17 - 19 February.

Write to PO Box 11 152 Wellington.

Dunedin Conference on Social Development.

Early March. Write to Dunedin Forum, PO Box 374, Dunedin.

5th Annual Anarchist Conference.

Workshops, networking, stimulation, skills. Easter Weekend, Wellington.

Contact: Committee for the Establishment of Civilisation, PO Box 14-156, Kilbirnie, Wellington.

Asia Development Bank Meeting

early May, Auckland. If interested in organising protest actions, write to Auckland Unemployed Workers Rights Centre, 33 Wyndham St, Auckland.

Tour of Leonor Briones from the Freedom From Debt Coalition, Philippines.

April - May. Write to the Philippines Solidarity Network, PO Box 2450, Christchurch if you want to help organise the tour.

Regional Contacts

Auckland:

David Flemming
33b Birdwood Cres.
Parnell
Ph: 358-4811

Hamilton:

Dale Frew
PO Box 9578
Ph: 824-4480

Catherine Hodges
34 Harwood St
PO Box 9053
Ph: 839-0094
Fax: 838-0398.

Palmerston North:

Duncan Killiner
17 Worchester St.
Ph: 3549932.

or

c/o MUSA, Post Box
Massey University.
Ph: 357-4121
Fax: 354-2756
(Jannie Bichan and Steve
Collett can also be contacted
about AYN.)

Wellington:

Alistair Shaw
13 Hall St
Newtown
Ph: 389-7665

Emma Haxton
Kilbirnie Youth Centre
Ph: 384-8301

Nelson:

Kate McPherson
23 Wellington St
Ph: 548-9036

**As Kate is on the move
and working in Wellington
she is looking for some-
one to take her place as a
contact in Nelson. Are
you interested?**

Christchurch:

Melanie Thomson
10 Southey St
Ph: 337-3465

(If anyone else from Christchurch would like to be a contact please get in touch with the collective in Dunedin and Melanie in Christchurch)

Dunedin:

Cybele Locke
17 Blacks Rd.
North East Valley
Ph: 473-0684.

National:

111 Moray Place
Dunedin.

First of all, apologies for the lateness of last month's issue. Xmas and a lack of material caught up on us. Keep sending stuff in - we always need more!

Being the first month of Maori language year, a few comments on the media and Maori. Ideally, I think that AYN should come out in Maori and English. This is not possible, because there are few Maori or Maori speakers involved in AYN, and none in the production of the magazine, and because we can't afford to get the English articles translated. I think that this reflects both the lack of resources given to Maori language and media, and the failure of what is a mainly Pakeha movement to grapple with 'Maori' issues.

By 'the movement', I don't just mean AYN, but the wider 'progressive' movement that we come from. As in so many of our areas of work, it seems that there is a willingness to go forward on this 'problem', a recognition that something needs to be done, but no clear direction or idea of where to go. Recognising that, for example, the Building our own Future Project, was a Pakeha projec., taking pride in that, and dealing with a Maori partner (the Maori Congress in this case) is a step forward. But what then? What are the implications for us on a day to day level? How should, and how could AYN respond as a network and as a magazine?

Big questions - any answers?

Keep fighting, keep thinking,

Joss.

The E-mail address for AYN is:
kyle.matthews@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Subscriptions:

\$9 Unwaged / Student
\$18 Waged
\$25 Organisation
\$50 Institution

This subscription is for a whole year (12 issues). If you cannot afford this, write to us and we will send you AYN anyway. We appreciate any and all articles, news, art, criticism and gossip!

Inside:

Sept 28 Police report	2
Organising against ACT	3
The Mutual Assistance Programme	4
Intellectual Property Rights	6
The Fiscal Envelope	8
NZ Corporate Profits	9
Todd Report	10
Response to Fergus Wheeler	11
International News	14
Coming Up	14

Aotearoa Youth Network
111 Moray Place
Otepoti / Dunedin

Kyle Matthews
836a cumberland st
Dunedin

19 Rawhiti Tce
Kelburn
Wellington

new zealand 45c

